

the original claims, as filed, for example, increase of arachidonic acid release, stimulation of thromboxane production, and stimulating prostacyclin formation is found within the original claims and the specific amount of increase at page 4 and throughout the Examples; dosage at page 7.

Election of species

The Examiner is thanked for pointing out the claim wording. Applicants have made efforts herein to correct claim 23 and have added new properly joined method claims 45-48. Since many of the limitations have been added to claim 23, re-writing claims 24-28 has become a moot issue.

35 USC 112

Applicants thank the Examiner for her efforts and request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney of record should any further claim amendments be necessary to place this application into condition for allowance.

35 USC 102(b)

Applicants have significantly amended the claims to further define the invention over the art of record. In particular, neither the '356 nor the '761 patent disclose such an unexpected increase in the results from the selection of the specific isomer 9Z,11Z, which has been added as a limitation to the claims. Further, '356 does not appear to be a pharmaceutical patent, neither the '356 nor the '761 point out anything special about the "9cis-11cis" selection. In fact, a close review appears to show that the '761 patent actually teaches away from the "cis-cis" and instead focuses on the "cis-trans". Given the limitations now in the claims, applicants believe that the issue of novelty no longer applies and request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

35 USC 102(e)

Applicants limitations concerning "9cis-11cis" are relevant in addressing this rejection, and since neither the '761 nor the 486 teach the selection of the specific isomers claimed herein. Example 3 doesn't show that 9Z,11Z is encompassed by the scope of the claimed invention in '486; it shows what happens without urea fractionation. Further, column 9 of the 486 similar to the

'761 patent, teaches away from invention as currently claimed. Accordingly, applicant request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

35 USC 103

Although the art is close in this field, by limiting the claims to the specific isomers and by pointing out and claiming the unexpected results, the rejections under 103 are believed to be addressed for both the method claims and for the composition claim. However, if the Examiner wishes to discuss this issue or make any suggestions, the undersigned attorney requests a call to expedite prosecution and so this application can move to allowance.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds for objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated or rendered moot. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and objections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Prompt and favourable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

With best regards,

/ Todd L. Juneau /

21 March 2007

Todd L. Juneau
Reg. No. 40669
JUNEAU PARTNERS
USPTO Customer 50438
2506 Clay Street
Alexandria, VA 22302
(703)706-0405
todd@juneaupartners.com

Date